

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 2, 4-6 and 9, cancels claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 and adds new claims 12-14. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14.

The disclosure stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. A Substitute Specification is now being prepared to correct the informalities and will be filed once completed. Accordingly the Substitute Specification will correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. As indicated above, claim 8 was canceled. Therefore, this rejection is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0105837) in view of Sundsted (article entitled "JNDI overview, Part 1-Part 4, JavaWorld.com"); claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen in view of Sundsted and further in view of Hamilton (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,507); claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen in view of Sundsted and further in view of Zhao (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0099970); claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kamen in view of Sundsted, Hamilton, further in view of Zhao and Choy (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,194); and claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamen in view of Sundsted further in view of Bortvedt (articled entitled "Functional Specification for Object Caching Service for Java, 2.0). As indicated above, claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 were canceled. Therefore, these rejections with respect to claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections with respect to claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that the cancellation of claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 was not intended nor should it be considered as an agreement on Applicants part that the features recited in claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. The cancellation of claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 was simply intended to expedite prosecution of the present application. Applicants hereby reserve their right to pursue the invention as set forth in claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 in a continuing application.

These rejections with respect to the remaining claims 2, 4-6 and 9 are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 2, 4-6 and 9 are not taught or suggested by Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao and Bortvedt whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to recite that the present invention is directed to a distributed object controlling method for a first computer for executing an object and having first and second reference-information storage areas.

The distributed object controlling method includes storing, when executing an object in said first computer, object reference-information for said object in said second reference-information storage area, and judging, when executing a retrieval request of another object, whether or not object reference information on said another object has been stored in said second reference-information storage area, executing, when said object reference information on said another object has been stored in said second reference-information storage area, communication with said another object based on said object reference information of said another object, judging, when said object reference information on said another object has not been stored in said second reference-information storage area, whether or not object reference information on said another object has been stored in said first reference-information storage area, executing, when said object reference information on said another object has been stored in said first reference-information storage area, communication with said another object based on said object reference information on said another object stored in said first reference-information storage area, sending, when said object reference information on said another object has not been stored in said first reference-information storage area, a retrieval request to said second computer for

providing a naming service, said retrieval request including said object name of said object, storing object reference information and an object name of said object into said first reference-information storage area, said object reference information being acquired as the response to said retrieval request, and executing communication with said another objection based on said acquired object reference information.

According to Applicants the object of the present invention is to shorten the processing time for an object call-up by reducing the number of communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, to reduce a load onto the naming service by reducing the number of communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, or to reduce communications that occur when making a processing request to an object that exists within an identical process.

Attention is directed to page 2, lines 4-15 of the present application.

Particularly, the present invention as now recited in claims is fully supported by Fig. 14 and the corresponding descriptions of the present application that shows storing object reference information and an object name of said object into said first reference-information storage area, by Fig. 1 which shows the first reference-information storage area, and by Fig. 9 which shows storing, when executing an object in said first computer, object reference-information for said object in said second reference-information storage area, and judging, when executing a retrieval request of another object, whether or not object reference information on said another object has been stored in said second reference-information storage area.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the

references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao or Bortvedt whether said reference are taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Although the Office Action uses the Hamilton reference to reject some of the claims, the claims rejected based on the Hamilton reference were all cancelled. Therefore, the remaining references are treated below. However, the same arguments presented below with respect to the remaining references apply as well to Hamilton.

Kamen teaches a Client Cache (Fig. 2, 24) for Proxy Instance and describes: The client runtime 24 also stores a reference to the newly-created proxy instance in the client cache 22.

Zhao teaches Cluster in the Naming Service (Fig. 2; [0028]) and to automatically remove the stale object reference from the cluster ([0036]). Each cluster contains its own unique object binding table which contains object references which each typically represent a single server ([0031]).

Bortvedt teaches to return a reference to the object associated with name (page 15 last para.).

However, none of the references as described above teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now recited in the claims. Particularly, none of the references teach or suggest shortening the processing time for an object call-up by reducing the number of communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, reducing a load onto the naming service by reducing the number of communications that occur at the time of the retrieval, or reducing

communications that occur when making a processing request to an object that exists within an identical process as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao or Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest storing, when executing an object in said first computer, object reference-information for said object in said second reference-information storage area, and judging, when executing a retrieval request of another object, whether or not object reference information on said another object has been stored in said second reference-information storage area as recited in the claims.

Further, each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao or Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest executing, when said object reference information on said another object has been stored in said second reference-information storage area, communication with said another object based on said object reference information of said another object and judging, when said object reference information on said another object has not been stored in said second reference-information storage area, whether or not object reference information on said another object has been stored in said first reference-information storage area as recited in the claims.

Still further, each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao or Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest executing, when said object reference information on said another object has been stored in said first reference-information storage area, communication with said another object based on said object reference information on said another object stored in said first reference-information storage area and sending, when said object reference information on said

another object has not been stored in said first reference-information storage area, a retrieval request to said second computer for providing a naming service, said retrieval request including said object name of said object as recited in the claims.

Still further yet, each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao or Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest storing object reference information and an object name of said object into said first reference-information storage area, said object reference information being acquired as the response to said retrieval request, and executing communication with said another objection based on said acquired object reference information as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since each of Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao and Bortvedt fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims, combining these references in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action fails to render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 2, 4-6 and 9 as being unpatentable over Kamen, Sundsted, Zhao and Bortvedt is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-11.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 12-14. New claims 12-14 recite many of the same features recited in claims 2, 4-6 and 9 shown above not to be taught or suggested by the above noted references of record. Therefore, the same arguments presented above with respect to claims 2, 4-6 and 9 apply as well to claims 12-14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of the present application based on claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 12-14 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.42890X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/Carl I. Brundidge/

Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120